

## REMARKS

This is a simultaneous amendment with request for continued examination (RCE) filed under 37 C.F.R. 1.114 in response to the Notice of Allowance dated May 6, 2009.

This simultaneous amendment has been filed to prosecute claims in which the broader term “concentrator” is used instead of the more narrow term “parabolic mirror”, since it is believed that the scope of these two terms is not the same and that applicants are entitled to broader patent claim coverage than provided by the allowed claims 23 to 29 as amended by the Examiner’s amendment in the Notice of Allowance.

It is respectfully submitted that new claims 30 to 35 added by this simultaneous amendment should also be allowed in addition to the allowed claims 23 to 29.

The new claims 30 to 35 are effectively amended claims 17 to 22 (canceled by the Examiner’s amendment), which only claim subject matter which the Examiner informed the applicants’ representative was allowable. During the telephone interview the Examiner pointed out the limitations in claim 23 that convinced him to allow claims 23 to 29. These limitations appear in the next-to-last and second-to-last paragraphs of allowed claim 23.

During the telephone interview applicants’ representative asked the Examiner if claim 17 would be allowable over the prior art disclosures if the same

limitations were introduced from claim 23 into claim 17. The Examiner agreed that claim 17, if it was amended to include the indicated limitations of claim 23, would be allowable over the prior art. However he stated that he felt that a claim 17, which was amended in that way, would essentially be a duplicate of claim 23 because the “concentrator” of the amended claim 17 was equivalent to or the same as the “parabolic reflector” of claim 23.

The applicants do not agree with the opinion of the Examiner that the terms “parabolic reflector” and “concentrator” have the same scope and believe that there is a loss of patent claim coverage if no claims are filed with the term “concentrator”.

During the telephone interview applicants’ representative disagreed with the assertion that the concentrator and the parabolic reflector would necessarily be the same. He stated that “parabolic” refers to a particular shape, namely a parabolic shape and that the concentrator could have other shapes, such as spherical, which differs from parabolic, or even an irregular polygonal shape.

In view of the position of the Examiner during the telephone interview that a claim 17 amended to include the indicated limitations from claim 23 overcomes the only remaining rejection, namely the obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) over Delgado, et al; Kuckelkorn, et al; and further in view of Bunch, new claims 30 to 35 should be entered and allowed with the already allowed claims 23 to 29 as amended by the Examiner’s amendment.

For the aforesaid reasons and because the limitations that resulted in allowance of independent claim 23 have been included in new independent claim 30, allowance of the new claims 30 to 35 over the prior art of record, especially Delgado, et al; Kuckelkorn, et al; and Bunch, is respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawing be further amended or corrected in formal respects to put this case in condition for final allowance, then it is requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment and the case passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing the case to allowance, he or she is invited to telephone the undersigned at 1-631-549-4700.

In view of the foregoing, favorable allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Michael J. Striker,

Attorney for the Applicants

Reg. No. 27,233